

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-20 and 27-32 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants are canceling claim 6 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 15-20, and 28-30 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation previously in claim 6, indicating that the filter is a low-capacity protein adsorption filter. Support can be found at least in claim 6 as originally filed. Claims 2 and 12 have been amended to remove multiple dependencies from the claims. Claim 7 has been amended to change its dependency from now-cancelled claim 6 to claim 1 and to modify the claim language of claim 7 to more closely reflect the language in claim 1. Claim 13 has been amended to be an independent claim, to include the limitations of claim 1, and to remove multiple dependencies from the claim. Claims 15-20 and 28-30 have been amended to remove multiple dependencies and to ensure the claims' correct dependencies to independent claims 1 and 13. Support can be found at least in the claims as originally filed. New claims 33-41 have been added. Claims 33-41 depend from claim 13 and include limitations present in claims that originally depended from claim 1. The new claims correspond to claims that depend from claim 1 and have been added to maintain correct hierarchy of numbering of claims so that lower-numbered claims do not depend from higher-numbered claims. The following table presents the relationship between the new claims and previously pending claims.

Table 1. Claim Correspondence and Support

New Claim: Depends from Claim 13	Corresponds to Original Claim that Depends from Claim 1
33	2
34	3
35	4
36	5
37	7
38	8
39	9

40	10
41	11

Support for the new claims can be found at least in the claims as originally filed (see Table 1). As a result, claims 1-5, 7-20, 27-41 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 13 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner indicates at paragraph 6 on page 6 of the Office Action mailed August 10, 2005 that claims 6, 7, 13-17, and 28-32 are clear of the prior art of record and that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Independent claim 1, as amended, includes the limitation of claim 6. Claim 13, as amended, is an independent claim that includes the limitations of previously pending claim 1. Applicants submit that the claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner and believe that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-12, 18-20, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Kalchman et al., (WO 97/18825).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation from claim 6 as originally filed. Claim 1, as amended, is drawn to a method of detecting the presence of detergent- or urea-insoluble amyloid-like fibrils or protein aggregates in a sample that has been previously treated with detergent or urea to solubilize the sample by filtering the sample through a filter with a low capacity for protein adsorption to capture the detergent- or urea-insoluble amyloid-like fibrils or protein aggregates; and detecting detergent- or urea-insoluble amyloid-like fibrils or protein aggregates that are retained on the filter. Thus, the amended claim includes the limitation that the sample is filtered through a filter with a low capacity for protein adsorption, a limitation that is not taught or disclosed in the Kalchman et al. reference. As described in the response filed May 25, 2005, and accepted by the Examiner as evidenced by the withdrawal of the rejection of

claim 6 as anticipated by Klachman, et al., Applicants submit that the PVDF membrane Immobilon-P, which is the membrane disclosed in the Kalchman et al. reference, is described by its manufacturer as desirable for use because of its high protein adsorptivity, a feature directly in contrast with the filter characteristics set forth in claim 6, namely a low capacity for protein adsorption. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, and the claims that depend from claim 1, are not anticipated by the Kalchman et al. reference.


Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-12, 18-20, and 27 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 anticipated by Kalchman et al., (WO 97/18825) is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Erich Wanker et al., Applicant(s)*

By:   
MaryDilys S. Anderson, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 52,560  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206  
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Docket No.: V0179.70001US00  
Date: November 10, 2005  
**x11/10/05x**